

CP378
UR84
[MAY 1967]

THE GRAND INQUISITOR

[May 1967]

**THE LIBRARY OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF
NORTH CAROLINA
AT CHAPEL HILL**



**THE COLLECTION OF
NORTH CAROLINIANA**

Cp378
UR84
[May 1967]

May 1967

THE GRAND

INQUISITOR





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

https://archive.org/details/grandinquisitors00cath_0

CPS 18
UR 84
[May
1967]

EDITOR'S NOTE: THE ACTION OF THE STUDENT LEGISLATURE WHICH IS THE SUBJECT OF THIS EDITORIAL WAS TAKEN AFTER WE WENT TO PRESS. HOWEVER, THE ACTION IS SO CLOSELY RELATED TO THE PURPOSES OF THIS MAGAZINE THAT WE HAVE ADDED THIS PAGE IN ORDER TO COMMENT ON THE SITUATION.

Student government on this, and most campuses, is unbegrudgingly conceded to be monumentally irrelevant for all but those who are elected or appointed officials of it. It is simply a large play pen in which future politicians go through the motions of introducing, debating, and passing bills, prosecuting boyish miscreants, and going on record about unimportant matters.

However, Student Government here suddenly seemed to be verging on relevancy this February. At that time, some legislators objected to the Student Body President's signing a letter to President Johnson which questioned the administration's Vietnam policy. These legislators thought that the letter did not represent the opinion of the student body. They wanted a referendum to determine the opinion of the student body on the issues raised in the letter. After three months of preparation, as we all know now, the referendum has been called off by the student legislators, in fact by some of the very legislators who called the referendum in the first place.

Precise reasons are unclear at this time for this action. The reasons given are the only ones that we can comment about, namely, that some elements on this campus would use the results of the referendum for "their own purposes." Presumably, what is meant is that it was becoming clear that the referendum was expected to show that the student opinion was against the administration policy in Vietnam. In fact, in a straw vote taken by Senator Edward Kennedy at his recent speech here showed that the majority of those present favored a more moderate policy than the administrations. Further, the debate between Lowenstein and Davidson showed the administration's policy in a bad light.

Moreover, it seems highly implausible that the legislature was afraid of a "hawkish" outcome to the referendum. Indeed, it was the very prospect of such an outcome that moved some of the originals of the referendum. The statements of the legislators who called for the referendum left no doubt that they were looking for Bob Lowell, the Student Body President, to be rebuffed in a campus wide referendum. Had Lowell been rebuffed, it is to be presumed that the opponents of his signing the letter would have used the results of the referendum "to their own purposes."

So it appears that rather than let this student body go on record as opposing the administration's policy in Vietnam, the student legislature called off the referendum. The political cowardice of this move has stunned most of the campus. Rather than admit defeat, the backers of the referendum called the whole thing off. In view of such childishness, anger gives way to pity. The make-believers were not ready to come out and play with the big boys. Indeed, if all that was in question was the immaturity of student legislators, the sordid episode would not be worth comment.

However, more important issues are raised by this action of the student legislature. The issue here is whether the willful machinations of this student legislature, or any small clique,--for whatever reasons--can silence by an arbitrary action the free expression of opinion. The frightening spectre that is brought to mind is that of dictatorial governments that allow referenda to the "electorate" when the governments are sure of the outcome. It is deeply disturbing to think that there are young people who aspire to a life of politics in this country who feel that they have the power of life and death over the expression of opinion. It is, moreover, sad to think that this University has so thoroughly failed to inculcate respect for the expression of opinion in its students that these students feel themselves competent to judge whether, and whose, opinions will be heard. Free men ought to recoil from the sight of such crass manipulation which we have seen in the handling of this referendum.

Finally it is not a question of hawks and doves, but it is a question of the democratic foundations of our way of life. Those who may have thought they were keeping the University from embarrassing the national administration or the university administration or the state administration have ended by disgracing that upon which all these administration must stand if they are to stand at all.

THE GRAND INQUISITOR, a Journal of Opinion Edited by the Catholic Graduate
Students Association of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

+ + + + + + + +

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EDITORIALS AND OPINIONS

The Grand Inquisitor Award of the Month.	pg. 2
Svetlana and the Anti-Communists.	pg. 2
Back Home and Over There.	pg. 3
The Catholic at a Secular University.	pg. 4

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS. pg. 6

ARTICLES

From Geneva to Vietnam, by Michael Hollis.	pg. 8
A Rationale for Catholic Higher Education by Timothy S. Healy, S.J.	pg. 14

+ + + + + + + +

SEND LETTERS TO THE EDITORS TO:

The Grand Inquisitor
c/o the YM-YWCA Building
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, N. C.

+ + + + + + + +

Board of Editors: Jacques Gerin, Charlene Haykel, Connie Hood, Susan Parry,
Richard Parry, William Provost, Clare Payne, Dan. Sheerin.

EDITORIALS AND OPINIONS

Grand Inquisitor Award of the Month

We are happy to announce the Torquemada Medal for this month goes to the Board of Trustees of the Catholic University of America. It is given in recognition of those members of the board whose treatment of Fr. Charles E. Curran affirms once again this university's stand that free inquiry in any academic discipline, even theology, is less important than indoctrination and propaganda. But more important than the handling of Fr. Curran is the forthright way that this action makes immeasurably less believable the work of proponents of academic freedom in other Catholic universities and colleges. How deftly, for instance, the board at Catholic University throws into the shadows the liberalized policies of Notre Dame, Fordham, Georgetown, and St. Louis.

But this month's award is not given for this one instance. Actually, Catholic University has covered itself with glory in countless other incidents. Who can forget the brilliant justice of the administration who ignored the recommendation of the theology faculty in refusing to hire a medieval historian simply because the man was Episcopalian and not Roman Catholic? But perhaps even more memorable was the prudent refusal, several years ago, of the rector of the university to allow a lecture series to be given by Hans Kung, Karl Rahner, and Godfrey Diekmann. The rector did not wish these corner stones of modern Catholic theology to confuse the unformed minds of the university students; he was soon thereafter elevated to the episcopacy.

It is, therefore, with a deep sense of gratitude that we make this long overdue award to those who still make it possible for us to deny that intellectual freedom has a place in Catholicism.

Svetlana and the Anti-Communists

It is no secret that the chief reason many elements of the non-intellectual right wing in this country are anti-Communist is that Communism jeopardizes their material wealth. Consequently, for them, the evil of Communism is primarily economic. Others of the non-intellectual right wing who have little material wealth, and presumably no great vested interest, also see the main difference between Communism and democracy to be a question of private property or private enterprise.

It is ironic then that these very people will doubtless find comfort in Svetlana Alliluyeva's coming to America. They will see it as a vindication of their anti-

Communism. The irony in the situation is that she has come here not to indulge in private enterprise but to be free to express herself--and this freedom is the one the non-intellectual right wing least understands.

It is surely ironic that the American Legion Posts that supported the Speaker Ban Law--as well as providing posters for the merchants on Franklin Street which imply expression of dissent on Vietnam is unpatriotic--that those Posts doubtless have members who count Miss Alliluyev's coming to America to seek freedom of expression as a victory for democracy. It is surely ironic that many admirers of Jesse Helms of WRAL, who attacked the publication of young Unc writers in the Carolina Quarterly, will welcome Miss Alliluyeva's coming to America as testimony against the Communist way of life--Miss Alliluyeva whose condemnation of the Communist way of life was the young Russian writers can not be published in Soviet Russia.

To others, it should give us pause to think that anyone, and not only the Bir-chite and the Legionnaire, who likes to be thought of as a proponent of freedom can too easily become its enemy. It is said that constant vigilance is the price of freedom. Although it is not said, it is surely implied that vigilance here includes self vigilance.

--R. D. P.

Back Home and Over There

I should like to imagine two domestic occurrences, neither of which is unprecedented in the past nor at all impossible in the future. Let us say that the police apprehend a member of a large and effective narcotics ring. This person is arrested with the definite knowledge that he is involved in the ring and that he knows where and when some crucial deliveries of large quantities of narcotics are soon to be made. The person refuses to divulge this information to the police. The police, in desperation, proceed to tie him up and kick and punch and in sundry less delicate ways extract the needed information from him. In the second instance, the police are seeking the arrest of a certain notorious criminal the bringing of whom to justice is required by the law and the safety of many others. This criminal is kept under surveillance and is seen entering a theatre. The police stake out the theatre. As the criminal leaves the theatre, he unfortunately spots the police and draws his gun; the police demand that he surrender, he fires at them, they immediately reply, thus firing at him in front of a dense crowd leaving the theatre, and thus killing a large number of innocent people.

Now I should like to turn to the world of fact, of past event. We have all seen photographs of the "interrogation" of captured Viet-Cong soldiers or suspected Viet-Cong guerrillas; we have seen U. S. Army personnel punching, kicking, and here even the news photographer's flair for the dramatic fails us and we do not see in photographs the less conventional means of "interrogation" being employed. We

have read of U.S. aircraft quite by accident, under radar guidance dropping their bombs, intended for quite military targets, on civilians, and thus quite by accident destroying innocent lives.

The predictable public response to the hypothetical instances I sketched and the actual response to the actual events which we have all seen reported would be indeed very disparate. The imagined events would be greeted by a great public outcry. The savage treatment of a prisoner, however guilty, by the police would be the occasion of inquests, of editorials and numberless statements to the effect that in an effort to preserve society we are destroying its very foundations in so depriving a man of his human rights. The careless slaughter of a large number of citizens by the police in their zeal to apprehend a criminal would cause an even greater outcry and be quite enough to topple most any police commission and perhaps even the incumbent city government. The reaction to the real events in Viet Nam has been rather different. True, a tiny minority has become aroused; but due to their own ill advised procedures and due to the attitude current in many circles that the Viet Nam involvement requires a sort of teleological suspension of the democratic this repressed protest has had little effect. The general reaction has been to deplore this denial of a person's rights and this slaughter of innocents in most grave and sympathetic terms but at the same time to label it all as quite "necessary," really (war is hell, and all that) to be expected when free men arm, and in point of fact nothing about which to become very excited. It becomes I think plain that war causes men who are, as it were, by very definition of their role as American soldiers, lovers of freedom and defenders of rights to ignore the freedoms and the rights for which they are ready to die. It is plain that war prompts a public and an electorate which has been (with notable exceptions) jealous of the rights and safety of others to deplore (with all the inactivity and passivity which that word has come to imply), and indeed by a marvelous piece of ethical mumbo jumbo even to condone what they would otherwise abhor and prevent. This insensitivity, this aberration from what are the moral foundations of free society gives this writer great pause, and cause him to wonder not a little about the admission of the possibility of war, now or ever again, by the morally sensitive person.

-- D. J. S.

The Catholic at a Secular University

In his article, Father Healy defines the raison d'etre of a Catholic university in terms of responsibilities particularly to the Church and to America. His presentation suggests an analogous topic of discussion relevant to UNC, namely the responsibilities of a Catholic connected with a non-Catholic university. There are few people now who would try to argue that Catholics should be educated from kindergarten to college in Catholic schools. Such opinions, of course, have been held--it is only within the last five years, for example, that graduates from Regis, the well-known Jesuit high school in New York City, have been allowed to apply to

non-Catholic colleges. The question of whether there should be some specifically Catholic education at some point, and if so, where--grade school, high school or college--is an interesting one, but I will not pursue it here. Beginning with the fact that there are Catholics studying and teaching at "secular" universities, and with the assumption that they are not all there simply because there was no room for them at the inn, I would like to suggest briefly some ideas as to what sort of responsibilities are, and what sort are not, implied in this situation.

I think it is safe to say that few Catholics have any special gift of wisdom from the Holy Spirit that makes them intellectual leaders in their particular fields. Going to Mass on Sunday does not help a student solve a physics problem, or interpret a poem. It won't even help him in Latin much any more. There is, however, a relation between the beliefs of a Catholic and his scholarly endeavors, in that each is an approach to reality. This is, of course, true of any religious belief, since the very fact of belief is an indication of a particular view of reality. the danger inherent in this is that of making studies serve belief. There can be no real conflict between knowledge and belief, and perhaps the most important responsibility of the Catholic at a secular university is to show this. In working out a physics problem, or interpreting a poem, it is done with the basic beliefs of the person present, but the beliefs do not affect the actual work. The poem may affirm or deny the idea of the value of human dignity, or may not be particularly concerned one way or the other. The scholar must be able to read it whichever way is more correct, and be able to make a judgment about its relative merit which is not affected by his belief. As I said, this is a problem which affects anyone holding religious beliefs, but it can, I think, be particularly acute for a Catholic. The Church has often tended, both in and out of its universities, to be selective in its use of knowledge--accepting that which is clearly in line with the articles of faith and rejecting that which is not. It is only by showing a real faith in the validity of things known as well as things believed that a Catholic indicates his position of accepting reality as basically sensible.

Finally there is the question of being a witness to the Church within the intellectual environment of the university. What sort of responsibility does the Catholic have here/ It would seem that the responsibility is not one so much of specifics as of general attitude. I have doubts as to the efficacy of such acts of witness as loud statements in the lunch line: "Well, Friday again, wonder what kind of fish we'll get." (nowadays not likely to be said by a Catholic anyway) or carrying rosary beads dangling out of a pocket. Rather, I think that a certain openness concerning Catholicism can be effective. The "miracle, mystery and authority" motif has been associated with the Church for a long time. It is not truly part of the Church and certainly is indefensible in the atmosphere of a modern university. The Catholic intellectual in such an atmosphere must be able to discuss, practice his religion in a simple, honest and straightforward way.

-- W. P.

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

Dear sirs:

The Grand Inquisitor! What a lovely idea! I was reading the story to the children the other day, and here you come up with it for a magazine title! When I told Alice, Allegra and Edith with golden hair about it their little eyes nearly bugged out. They all joined their dear little hands and skipped around in a circle singing:

Winnie the Pooh
We love Vat II.

Golly, I have to tell you about "Grand Inquisitors I have met." They're all as alike as two ticks in a hog's ear as Pappy used to say. They got two handles and you never do know what's in the middle. Grab one handle and it's soft and squishy--yetch! Baby Jesus piety. Blindobedience is the only way through a booby trapped universe. March off under the fluttering banners of the legion of Mary to storm Jeff's. I guess this is all right; we all have our pulpy sides. But it's the other handle, the flinty one, that cuts you up. Grab them there and you find a highly selective orthodoxy. Pope Rameses III's address to the Convocation of Italian Ford Dealers holds more truth than the Gospel of St. John. Take for example the current hassle about noseblowing. It seems obvious that a gentle honking into the handkerchief is the only civilized way about it in our congested cities. (O dear me, I think I made a funny!) But a minority--3 out of 57--of experts on nasal morality, called all the way to Rome just to discuss this, hold that a finger to the side of the nose and honking into the weeds is the only "natural" way to do it. The only way nature could imagine for the thousands of years before Kleenex was invented. (And meanwhile, Kleenex stock wobbles uncertainly in the market). Aside from all of this being a bit disgusting the whole thing is too gross an example of the Inquisitor's flinty handle, his selective orthodoxy, chopping people up again. I'm no theologian, but when I got my agrege in moral theology from the Angelicum during my year's study abroad from Vassar, they told all us girls about probable opinions, and about the fact that the largest change possible is from certainty to uncertainty. Why didn't anyone tell the Grand Inquisitor,

And talk about Viet Nam... Dear me, there I go again. Do you think I babble on, Well, back to the range again. The children are doing finger paints in the attic and I'm going to look again for Grandma's recipe for magnolia fritters.

Bye Y'all,

(Mrs.) Gloria Schmalzboden

Dear Sirs:

The Prologue in the first issue of The Grand Inquisitor rightly points out that the " . . . dignity of man . . . is denied by anyone who would surrender his . . . freedom." Freedom is the distinguishing characteristic of man. Consequently, it is through our free actions that we become most truly human.

Unfortunately, the Prologue seems to be overly concerned with only those constraints outside of man which threaten freedom and humanity. In urging man to "opt for freedom, " particular attention is called to "any institution which attempts to destroy this option." I believe it is more appropriate to be concerned with the interior condition of man as the primary obstacle to freedom, and it is in regard to improving the interior condition of man that The Grand Inquisitor will make its major contribution.

The weakest forces in the world which threaten freedom are those outside of man. The stronger forces are those of fear, prejudice, inordinate desire and weakness, all of which flow to some extent from ignorance. As long as man is ignorant of alternative courses of action which he may choose for himself, he is not free. As long as he is ignorant of the best course of action (that which fulfills his purpose in life), his happiness cannot be full.

Freedom, humanity and happiness are therefore constrained by lack of knowledge. Dispelling the darkness of ignorance and searching for the light of truth therefore make us free, human and happy, and for this service we look forward to future issues of The Grand Inquisitor.

Don Lauria

FROM GENEVA TO VIETNAM

Michael Hollis

Michael Hollis, a junior at UNC, fills in the crucial historical background to the Vietnamese war.

One might well ask at the outset what the Vietnamese war has to do with this magazine, or its announced purpose, which is to deal with freedom and any pertinent area of discussion. But I think that a closer examination of our goals in Vietnam, as well as a look at how we get there in the first place, will reveal that the whole Vietnamese problem comes a lot closer to the question of freedom than one might think at first glance.

Dienbienphu fell on May 7, 1954, and the Indochina phase of the Geneva Conference opened the next day. All the maneuvering and compromising that eventually took place at the Conference need not be told here, but the net result was two General Agreements. The first, the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities, was concerned chiefly with the technical problems of the new peace in Vietnam, the transfer of troops, the continuance of civil order, and the like. But there were several provisions worth mention here, all designed specifically to keep foreign powers out of the country. First of all, the entire country was temporarily divided into two zones, pending general elections, at the 17th parallel. Article 16 prohibited

the entry of any new military personnel or troop reinforcements into Vietnam, with the single exception of the "rotation" or certain military units. Article 17 banned the introduction of any reinforcements in form of military hardware, munitions, air and naval craft, armored vehicles, and other weaponry. Article 18 prohibited the building of any new military bases in Vietnamese territory. Article 19 prohibited either zone from joining into a military alliance with any foreign power. Article 34 set up an International Control Commission (ICC), consisting of representatives of Canada, India, and Poland, in order to supervise the implementation of the Agreement; but actual responsibility for "ensuring the observance and enforcement of the terms and provisions" of the Agreement was left, not with the ICC (which could only issue a series of reports), but with the "signatories of the present Agreement and their successors in their functions." (Article 27). The successor to the Vietminh was the zone of North Vietnam, and the successor to French power was the zone of South Vietnam.

The Final Declaration of the Geneva Conference (not signed by anyone, but agreed to by voice vote) was a somewhat more idealistic document, which set forth certain ideals of freedom and liberty, and expressed the hope that the coming general elections would re-unify the country on these principles. Some of the most notable sections of this Final Declaration are quoted here:

(Article 6, in total:)

The Conference recognizes that the essential purpose of the agreement relating to Vietnam is to settle military questions with a view to ending hostilities and that the military demarcation line is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary. The Conference expresses its conviction that the execution of the provisions set out in the present declaration and in the agreement on the cessation of hostilities creates the necessary basis for the achievement in the near future of a political settlement in Vietnam.

(Article 7, in total:)

The Conference declares that, so far as Vietnam is concerned, the settlement of political problems, effected on the basis of respect for the principles of independence, unity, and territorial integrity, shall permit the Vietnamese people to enjoy the fundamental freedoms, guaranteed by democratic institutions established as a result of free general elections by secret ballot. In order to ensure that sufficient progress in the restoration of peace has been made, and that all the necessary conditions obtain for free expression of the national will, general elections shall be held in July, 1956, under the supervision of an international commission composed of the representatives of the Member States of the International Supervisory Commission, referred to in the agreement on the cessation of hos-

tilities. Consultations will be held on this subject between the competent representative authorities of the two zones from July 20, 1955, onward.

In other words, by putting Article 6 into the Declaration, the Conference recognized that the division in Vietnam was military only. There was and is no difference between the North and South Vietnamese as regards religion, culture, custom, or even family ties. They are all Vietnamese, and to refer to the North Vietnamese as "foreigners" to the South Vietnamese, or to speak of the "independence" of the South Vietnamese, is absurd. The North and South Vietnamese are no more foreign to each other than the people of East or West Alaska.

Many prominent nations were represented at Geneva, including the British, the Chinese, France, the Soviet Union, and the United States. This country signed no Agreements at Geneva, but when the Conference closed on July 21, 1954, our representative, General Bedell Smith, declared that the United States would refrain from force or the threat of force to disturb the Geneva Agreements, and that it would look on any renewed aggression, in violation of the Agreements, as a serious threat to international peace and security.

As we all know, the elections never took place. It will be well to go into the reasons why they never occurred, but first it should be made clear just what would have happened if the elections had gone forward in 1956, as planned.

There is almost universal agreement among all authorities on the subject, both at that time and since, that if the elections had taken place, Ho Chi Minh would have emerged victoriously by a landslide margin. A statement which Eisenhower has written in his memoirs (Mandate For Change, p. 372) sums up the situation clearly: "I have never talked or corresponded with a person knowledgeable in Indo-chinese affairs who did not agree that had elections been held at the time of the fighting, possibly 80% of the population would have voted for the Communist Ho Chi Minh as their leader rather than Chief of State Bao Dai."

Nevertheless, it would seem that the United States, almost from the first, intended to hold the line in South Vietnam. The Greensboro Daily News of Monday, March 27, has on page 4 an article dealing with John Foster Dulles, in which it is made clear that he was very instrumental in persuading Eisenhower to retain a "viable military position" in South Vietnam in 1954. The SEATO treaty, which amounts to a blanket guarantee to South Vietnam that it would receive assistance and aid from the West in repelling "armed aggression," was concluded in September of 1954. On October 23, 1954, Eisenhower sent a letter to Ngo Dinh Diem which promised aid to South Vietnam in "developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means." This surely indicates that the United States looked forward to a permanent South Vietnam. The first mention of "subversion" in South Vietnam did not come by way of the neutral ICC until its Tenth Interim Report in 1960, and thereafter the ICC broke into factions. But previous to that time, the reports issued by the

ICC indicate that the U. S. had established a considerable presence in South Vietnam.

Whatever the specific nature of the U.S. guarantee of support for Diem--we will probably never know just what aid was promised--Diem himself was on radio on July 16, 1955, a memorable date in Vietnam's history. He announced that South Vietnam would not abide by the terms of the Geneva Agreements. The reasons he gave for his decision were chiefly two in number, and another has since been added by the advocates of our present policy in Vietnam. In my own opinion, the reasons are insufficient.

The first reason put forward was that South Vietnam did not sign the Geneva Agreements, and therefore was not bound to hold the elections. But while it is true that South Vietnam did not sign, I would insist that they were still bound to abide by the Accords. North Vietnam did not sign either, since no such entity existed at the time, but North Vietnam was obliged to implement the Accords. The two zones were created by the Geneva Agreements, and they were to be temporary only. For South Vietnam to unilaterally repudiate the treaty which brought it into existence was logically absurd and politically disastrous. There was never any question of North or South Vietnam signing anything. They were to be made and unmade by Agreements.

The second reason for suspension of elections was the best of all. Faced with a dictatorial regime of oppression and terror in the north. Diem said, there could never be any possibility of free elections, and therefore the South would not consent. First of all, it should be mentioned that the record of South Vietnam as a bastion of liberty is far from clean. Diem's treatment of his opponent, Dr. Phan Quang Dan, the passage of the notorious law 10/59, and his treatment of the ICC testify to the fact that he cared little for democratic institutions. Secondly, the Geneva Accords provided for pre-electoral consultative conferences. If the South Vietnamese were concerned with voting irregularity, they might have used the opportunity of these conferences to insist on the most severe regulation of voting. The North Vietnamese on July 19, 1955, sent a letter to the South, suggesting that the consultative conferences begin. They sent letters suggesting the same thing in May and June of 1956, July of 1957, March of 1958, and July of 1959 and 1960. Each time their letter was met with silence or a stinging reply, and the South Vietnamese refused completely to take part in any of these conferences. Quite apart from that, however, Diem's argument overlooks the wording of the Geneva Agreement, which is very important. If one takes the time to re-read article 7 above, he will find that the sequence of events envisioned is this: the elections are made antecedent to, and a necessary condition for, "fundamental freedoms, guaranteed by democratic institutions." The key phrases, when quoted out of order, can justify the refusal to hold elections because of what one side calls "the absence of democratic institutions." But it should be seen at once that this sort of reasoning must not be allowed. On this basis, either side may postpone elections indefinitely, by charging the other side with cheating. It should be obvious that in the case of Vietnam, where rivalry is intense and voting fraud is likely, that if we wait for the irregularities to settle before we have elections, we will be waiting until Judgement Day. Diem's second

reason is therefore invalid, because it applied to his own regime, because it is in blatant contradiction to a very realistic idea put into the Geneva Accords, and because he refused to take measures which were open to him to alleviate his grievances.

The third reason for not holding the elections has been advanced, in the years since, by advocates of our present stance in Vietnam. This position has it that the ordinary peasant in the field will admittedly vote for Ho Chi Minh, but only because he has never heard of any other politician on earth except Ho Chi Minh. The advocates of this view hold that the people of the countryside cannot really know what they are voting for if they choose Ho, and that therefore they should be protected from the consequences of their vote. This is perhaps the worst reason of all, for it implies, intentionally or not, that there are certain democracies on earth where the people really do understand the issues involved in voting. And that, of course, means the United States. Advocates of this position have obviously never taken Political Science 41 at the University, or any political science course anywhere, or they would not infer this. The first thing that any political scientist is taught nowadays is that "the people" of this country vote for the party, the personality of the candidate, and the nature of the times, usually in that order. The number of people who really understand the issue content of both parties in this country--supposedly the greatest democracy on earth--is appallingly low. Fortunately, the men who run for office have long careers of service to their country behind them. In the case of Vietnam, it is foolish to ask the peasant in the field to vote on issues if we do not do it ourselves. If Asians prefer to follow a charismatic leader, that is their choice.

In fact, all these reasons have a hollow ring. The truth is probably that Diem did not want to hold elections, because he and everyone else knew that he would be carried away by the popularity of Ho. So the elections were not held, and the Communists, furious that they had been cheated out of a certain electoral victory, decided, in 1960, to reunify Vietnam by force. The North Vietnamese viewed the risings in the South with ill-concealed joy, and when the United States began to step up its aid, the North replied with equal violence.

Perhaps now it can be seen how all this ties into the idea of "freedom," which is the topic of discussion in this magazine. What is going on in Vietnam is a civil war. The term "aggression" implies a coming from without, and the North Vietnamese are not foreigners, but Vietnamese: they are fighting in their own country, a country which has been divided permanently by the South Vietnamese government, in turn aided by the U. S. This explains why the Viet Cong view the recent elections in South Vietnam with alarm: far from re-unifying the country, this is merely another step in the process of insuring that South Vietnam will have its own government--forever. What would happen if, in the midst of this civil war, the United States stopped favoring the South Vietnamese government? That same government would fall to the ground in three weeks, or three months, for it controls only the cities. If left to their own destiny, the people of the South would not see fit to support their own government.

Can we do this? Can we allow others to choose communism?

The answer must be yes. Dostoevsky's thesis was the enforced good is no good at all. By forcing a man to choose good, or relieving him from the consequence of his evil choice, you thereby take away his freedom. I would submit that communism and capitalism are not involved here. The Russians were condemned around the world for smashing a popular rising in Hungary, not because they were communist, but because they were Russian, and had not business in Hungary, a nation of different language, history, culture, peoples. The Russians were condemned, and rightly so, because they had violated the self-destiny and sovereignty of the Hungarian nation, and gone hundreds of miles out of their way to do so. Similarly, the English were unjustified in their occupation of Ireland, and the French were unjustified in their occupation of Algeria. It took a brave man to admit defeat and wrongdoing in Algeria, whatever his other merits.

We are in Vietnam to establish a political settlement. By so doing, we are taking away the freedom of the Vietnamese people to decide for themselves. We seem to have decided that our own end is better than the one which the Vietnamese would choose if left to their own devices. And it is undoubtedly true that we could do more for Vietnam than Ho Chi Minh and the Communist Party, simply because we are richer. But Dostoevsky would never accept any such settlement, based on the ruins of the Vietnamese right of free choice. Vietnamese have no cultural or historical relation to us whatever, but we have come in, at the invitation of several governments which represent no one, to remove their freedom in the name of humanitarianism. By putting public welfare above freedom, we have sacrificed the latter. No one would object if we were fighting Italian communists in Norway, or Dutch communists in Nebraska, but we are fighting Vietnamese communists in Vietnam. I would strongly maintain that men must be free to choose their own government, whatever the consequences. By putting our money or our aid above freedom, we cheat the Vietnamese with comfort and cheat our own ideals, just as the Grand Inquisitor would "make all men happy" by removing their freedom.

The United States is still the last best hope of free men on earth. We cannot deny that freedom to others without denying it ourselves.

A RATIONALE FOR CATHOLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

Timothy S. Healy, S.J.,

Executive Vice-President of Fordham University

In the following article, originally read to the College and University Department of the National Catholic Educational Association in March of this year, Fr. Healy discusses the proper role of Catholic higher in respect to 20th Century America and the Church.

Sometimes the mood of a moment is more important than any other single thing in it. Catholic higher education is in one of those moods. The winds of change have caught us with too much canvas on, our compasses have all gone haywire, our crews are restive or openly mutinous, the rigging is full of banshees crying doom, and even the strongest among us can foresee the "sea romp over the wreck." Having started with a nautical metaphor I am tempted, and as always I yield, to conclude with one. We are all standing more or less bravely to our guns, waiting for the broadside we know will come, and muttering that ancient and blasphemous prayer of the Mariner under fire, "For what we are about to receive, O Lord, make us truly grateful."

The broadside in question can indeed be heavy. We are accused of everything from tyranny to libertinism. Prophets with and without grey beards arise to assure us that any religious commitment in higher education is inherently wrong, socially divisive, or financially impossible. We are assured that on the one hand clergy and religious are by nature or sacramental character incapable of educational leadership, and on the other that the laity are too clerically dominated for any rational exercise of independence. Even within our own walls we have to face various cross fires--from students demonstrating to prove that the Ten Commandments are a private morality, and faculty solemnly representing their God-given right not to teach to the steady lugubrious chants from Fathers or Sisters Treasurer that bankruptcy is upon us and the sheriff with a mighty watch just around the corner. Those of us who live in large religious orders with European headquarters have as well to cope with General Superiors who feel that we are still running "colleges" or "gym-

nasia" and who legislate accordingly; or with our European brethren who feel that education is a dying apostolate or that it no longer suits "the church of the diaspora." These attacks are echoed in pastoral trumpetings that only moral social values have importance, and thus the lot of us would be better employed in soup kitchens. We are, if you hearken to these voices, a mess. At best an embarrassment to ourselves and to the Church; at worst a curious and distasteful survival of triumphalism, destined as surely as the dodo for extinction.

Thus, the broadside somewhat mercifully administered. Nor would I strive to reject all the charges it contains. We are indeed as capable of star chamber and stubborn tyranny as we are of sentimental surrender. We are without the shadow of a doubt over expanded and too thinly spread. And it would be chauvinistic and silly of us to claim that the American Church has worked out a pattern for anything other than itself. But let us for a moment be American quite simply, the optimistic Americans of English novels, and acknowledge that we can digest only so much dirt.

THE AMERICAN CHURCH AND THE UNIVERSITY

I have, perhaps, been over exposed to English Jesuits with their imperial assumption that it is best for the Church not to be engaged in higher education. Even setting aside the brilliant progressiveness of English Catholicism, this argument when echoed by Americans, has always appeared to me to miss the American Church by miles. There is in it an element of treason to time, a betrayal of our moment in history. The American Church is here and now deeply committed to higher education. Qualify that fact as we will, it still remains a fact. And I am just square enough to accept facts, to accept that one as part of the charge the Holy Ghost makes to me and to all men of our time. We are surely no stronger for denying the sanctity of the actual. We can labor to change it, we can assault it with theory and experiment, we can sweat and strain not to block its evolution. But unless we start from it, we're lost. Professor McLuhan is right--no fish ever discovered water. Even if we lacked Dr. Conant to tell us, we have to start looking at ourselves with the loud proclamation that we are one fish that knows it's wet.

Let us take the acknowledgement of actuality, of being, one step further. Since Origen, historic Church has been no stranger to higher education. She is history's greatest and most successful magpie. She began with the civil organization of the world in which she lived--made that structure her own, subtly changed it to suit her needs, and out of it built the first great forms of her life--the diocese and its image the parish. From her Eastern colonies she stole the second great life form--the monastery. It, in turn, gave her by gradual evolution a third form, more complex and subtle, but curiously her own, the university. It was a new form, more Northern than Roman, more Western than Eastern, but no less a real life form than her others and earlier forms; less ideally a geographical and social setting for the working of grace.

It can be argued that the greatest sacrifice the Church made through the Reformation was the loss of the university. When one realizes that the piece for which she traded the university was the seminary, the sacrifice appears only the greater. But the whole sorry story has at least the beginning of a happy ending, miles from its original setting, and in accents then unknown. Our own presence and commitment is in the nature of a recovery rather than a fresh initiative. The motives for that recovery were as different as the places and the times in which it occurred. There is good evidence that none of the founding fathers, Bishops Carrol, Ireland, Hughes--none of them had universities in mind. No more did John Harvard, Eli Yale, or Commodore Brown. All told Leland Stanford and Chancellor Harpur had an easier task. For all that, the American Church has, willy nilly in most cases, restored to the Church one of her own life forms, rich with promise and power, and fillable as all her forms, with the grace of God. For us to talk of tossing aside this life form seems to me at least foolish, at worst criminal.

Only recently have we become aware of our own position. There are some who claim that we are not yet out of that famousghetto. In all fairness, "incubator" might be as good a word. Be that as it may, we come to a consciousness of ourselves and our own meaning at a time when higher education is becoming a matter of graver concern in American life than ever before. American colleges are now called on to be sources of manpower in a complex society, wells of information and criticism about that society, and direct public servants to that society. If their heads spin, they are hardly to be blamed. Each of them is striving to find and maintain a balance, no matter how precarious, against the three-way pull that besets them. President Perkins of Cornell has identified each pull, although he coyly avoids committing himself to a formula of priorities. The right sings elegies over the liberal arts, and the left plots revolutions on an academic base. Most of us, lacking the dreams of the one and the visions of the other, just spin in low level orbits.

There is, however, one constant: we are incurably pluralist. Whatever direction American higher education takes, it will lose this pluralism only if it wishes to cease being American. It's really a case of the lumps in the oatmeal being the main guarantee that the whole dish is fit to eat. And we find, perhaps to our consternation, that we are one of the lumps.

There are more dignified ways of putting that. If our educational plurality and thus by direct inference our national life, is to have any meaning at all, it is that the various elements that make up the plurality keep each its own identity. That may be called "divisive" and it is. But it's the kind of divisiveness that enables a man to tell his ear from his elbow--the kind of difference that makes for organic unity, rather than the kind of confusion that puts sleeves on our ears or the kind of uniformity that leads to the inert sameness of ten-pins. If ever this nation needed a plurality of academic voices it is now. And we, even as we are, are part of that plurality.

FREEDOM IN CATHOLIC EDUCATION

We are something else as well while we're talking about our service to our states and nation. We are free. You wouldn't know it to watch most of us cowering in the shadows of whatever local colossus we can find. But whether or not we ever choose to use our freedom, free we are. In many ways our freedom can be measured precisely by our religious commitment. First of all, it frees us from non-commitment, which has erected itself into an orthodoxy in academic America that would have warmed the hearts of our inquisitorial ancestors. Because we are catholic, in lower case, we are also freed from a whole series of absolutes. Having even a pretence of theology, we are saved from absolute physics, absolute art, absolute biology, absolute sociology—even from absolute athletics. Because we believe in God, we are also free from the kind of local customs that deny education because of color, or accent, or mailing address. For the same reason we should be free from the kind of localism that erects tribal customs, such as anti-semitism or capitalism into laws of nature.

As we are free "from" so we are free "to." We are free to challenge assumptions, and there are many that need challenging. Just to name one: isn't it time we took a long hard look at the passive and bourgeois "well-rounded man" we are so proud of? Is the world as we know it run by well-rounded men? Don't at least some of us have the obligation to find and encourage the angular, spiky, edgy, uncomfortable student who will change his world, no matter how many consecrated toes he treads on in the process? "Mens sana in corpore sano" is a good slogan, but it remains to be proven that it fits a 20th Century democracy as well as it undoubtedly fitted an 18th Century aristocracy.

We are also free to be ourselves. Most of Catholic higher education was built for immigrants, and like our great municipal systems, most of it was built by immigrants. How small an imaginative step it is from the Irish of the 1890's to the Negroes and Puerto Ricans of the 1960's. It's a step so small and over a path we've trod so often, that we should know it by heart. At least even we by now should have learned the irony of calling a lily white campus--catholic.

The greatest freedom is agility--we are free to move. Precisely because we're not tied in political red tape, we are free to make changes. This is what Martin Marty must mean when he says he would as soon work for a university that answered to the Reverend Pedro Arrupe, as for one which answered to the Honorable Ronald Reagan.

Let us make our changes rationally--but let us quite literally, for the love of God, make them. Let us make them in favor of the very bright as well as the very stupid. Let us make them for the poor and the affluent (we used to say rich). Some changes, mostly structural ones, will be forced on us by the developing patterns of governmental involvement in education. But others ranging from the Board of Trustees all the way down to the Athletic Association can be changes of our own design. What a jolt it would be to educational America if a Catholic university

worked out an answer to the relation of undergraduate to graduate work; or solved the problem of scholarship strangling teaching; or devised a non-technical defense for the humanities; or set up a curriculum that built values into learning; or, most marvelous of all, found how to get human beings back into the humanities.

THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY IN THE RENEWAL

Up to now I have spoken mostly of Catholic higher education in relation to American higher education generally. We have, however, another service to render. That is our service to the Church.

There is much in our time to remind us of that golden dawn of the 16th Century when the Christian world seemed to be swept by Spring winds of change. New voices were heard in the land, and the exhilaration of rebirth rode high in many men's minds. It was a still united world where More and Erasmus, Reuchlin and Reginald Pole could look towards a great renewal, a rebirth of that they loved the most on earth, the Bride of Christ.

Our own time has much the same mood and feel. The Council released energies in the Church that those of us who love her would have thought ten years ago humanly impossible. Possibilities opened up that left our imaginations breathless. The whole Church seemed to be moving in new directions, almost off on a fresh start. But like the Israelites in the desert, we are slowly discovering that Egypt is as much a state of mind as a place. We carry forward with us bits and pieces, from the past. If the Church is to free herself, to prepare for whatever glory or suffering awaits her now, she needs us. There is no holy exaggeration at all in claiming that she needs us now more than she ever has in the past.

First of all, she needs us as a place to think. I do not mean the kind of arid speculation that locks itself in logic and never arrives at a workable every day conclusion. The thinking I am speaking of is that particular to our time. We need a place where disciplines meet--in fact, more than meet, where they clash openly. The sheer density of modern life makes any one discipline, even Theology, a cripple as long as it tries to stand alone. The college and university faculty affords the Church a crossroads of skills and visions. And her immortal message is betrayed and compromised as long as it is denied full, free, and loving access to just the complexity of minds, disciplines, and views we sit down to lunch with every day.

In a very real sense, this complexity frees the Church from herself, above all from her own human past. "Time the destroyer is time the preserver, like the river with its cargo of dead..." Our greatest danger now is to see human structure as divine revelation; to feel ourselves locked into someone else's adaptation of the Pilgrim Church for another road, in another day. The labor of this freedom is multiplex and unending. And it is by definition a labor of many hands

and minds. No where else in the Church, not in Curia, Chancery, or Chapter, can all of man's hard-earned skills be brought to the lifetime's task of shucking what is only human and storing what is completely divine. The day when the Ecclesia Semper Reformanda can do her work without the free exercise of human intelligence is gone forever. And that free exercise involves not only individuals but collectives--collectives of skills, wisdoms, and men. In other words, faculties--in a literal and metaphorical unity.

Out of this kind of labor will come not only the insight needed to tell accidental from substantial, but a whole new pattern of relationships to the larger world in and of which the Church lives. We Catholics have relied in the past on the immigrant's primary weapon, muscle. It fed us, housed and clothed us, and also protected us. When threatened, our reaction was not to convince, or even to argue in an adversarial form, but to clout. Again, society has caught up with us. We must workout the presence of Christ in a host of complex worlds, worlds of learning and of service, worlds of understanding and worlds of love. All the muscle on earth will not serve the Church here. What will serve her is the slow process of analysis and confrontation by which the human wisdom as well as the sanctity of her teaching can be made audible. Her voice is assailed by other voices, shrieking, scolding, mocking, or merely chattering. If the Word is to be heard at all, this disconsolate chorus must be spoken to--and learned from--not clobbered into silence.

Perhaps there is more at stake in our faculty structure than even we realize. No matter what the weight of our own past, it is fairly clear that no new Reformation will rend the Church for the old reasons--greed, corruption, and sloth. There hasn't, thank God, been a Renaissance Pope since the Renaissance; and idleness and absenteeism are meaningless terms applied to today's hierarchy. If we are to be assaulted anew, the failure which draws attack will not be one of immoral life, but of tyrannous process. We will be assaulted not for sin, but for secrecy; for offense against what the modern world means by justice. In this forum lies, I feel, the greatest service our university and college structures can render to the Church. We are her open door into democracy and democratic process. Whether you say "open door" or "camel's nose" may well depend upon age or rank. But the fact is the same. The tragedy is that the university had to free itself from the star chamber, to commit itself with passion, not only to doing justice, but to making sure that its justice was seen to be done. Let us weep for the separation, but not let our tears blind us to what it has meant to our own position. Now when the Church needs the sincerity of open process, of free attack and defense, more than ever before, we can provide it for her, and no one else can. We are the one place, the one forum, where her ideas and every one else's can be stated, attacked and defended, not by edict or fiat, but by the wear of time and of many minds. The Church is old, and we are young. If it is true that "old men ought to be ex-planters" then we are the logical guides "into another intensity, a further union..."

Among the many reasons why this is true I should like to single out one. Up to now Catholic colleges and universities are the only structures within the Church which has successfully declericalized functions--in other words, the only place where by intent and pattern, laity and clergy have learned to work together. There are excuses for the length of time it has taken us to accomplish this, and I am careful not to claim that they work perfectly together. Their mixing is a new and heady blend--and one which excites and frightens us. But there is among many of us the beginning at least, of a unity of function to match an already established unity of purpose. There are without doubt other beginnings, and other places where starts have been made. But here and now, we are the largest, and the best established. In all humility, we are the pattern for the "whole Church".

Editor's note: This letter was received too late to be included in the Letters to the Editors. However, the editors felt that the letter was important enough to be included in this issue.

Baltimore, Maryland
May 9, 1967

Dear Editors:

Thank you so much for the first issue of The Grand Inquisitor which arrived just as I was reading the April 22, 1967 issue of America, with its provocative article on Freedom and the Christian Student, by John G. Milhaven. Like your own periodical this article is concerned with that most important of issues for every human being--freedom.

The Milhaven article states, "Man in his greatness, in what makes being a man worthwhile, is not a conformer. A man who puts the final meaning of his life in obeying laws is a sad sight. A man who puts the final meaning of his life in living a certain external way of life may well not be a sad sight, but he is living on the surface. The same may be said of a man who puts the final, the core meaning of his life in meeting obligations and respecting the rights of others, or in serving some cause, or in living according to human nature. If his gaze goes no deeper than that, he, too, must be living on the surface. None of these men, whose basic attitude is conformity to something outside their person, have reached the level where a man is finally a man."

In discussing the nature of this freedom, Father Milhaven continues, "What is the freedom in which man's greatness lies? It is not civil freedom, academic freedom, freedom of conscience. These and other freedoms flow from a more radical freedom that is man when he is truly a man. A man who is truly a man is one who--and the only one on earth who--can completely be himself, take possession of himself, determine himself. In this earth, only man wants something simply because he wants it. He wants it simply because he wants to be, and wants to be wanting this object. This wanting is the man.

In a beautiful pastiche of texts from St. Paul, Milhaven grounds his thesis in the Christian Scripture, "What our unbelieving contemporaries worship as unknown, this we proclaim to them. The God who made the world and everything in it, will set creation itself free from its bondage of decay and give it the glorious freedom of the children of God. This is the freedom for which Christ has freed us. So stand firm in it and do not get under a yoke of slavery again. For you, brothers, have been called to freedom. Where is this freedom? Wherever the spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom. From the Spirit of the Lord comes to us the freedom to remove the veil, to reflect the glory of the Lord on our unveiled faces, to be changed into His likeness, from one degree of glory to another." (Acts 17; Rom.8; Gal.5; Cor.3)

Recalling again that we are to be perfect as our heavenly father, and to grow more and more in His likeness, Milhaven recalls, "For God is the unbound, the lawless One. What could bind Him, arch and original breath? What law could He obey? He knows no rules. He simply is what He is: one sovereign untrammelled act of love. This is His very reality, His whole reality. He is freedom. Nothing can compel or awe or swerve Him in His love. By His one supremely free act of love He makes Himself and all that is.... He makes man to His image. When man falls enslaved to sin and law and death, God speaks to him by His Son. He says to man: 'You, I love you. Live with Me. Be like Me. Be free.'"

Finally, in case we may have missed the point, he sums up, "The most important thing for a man is not what he decides, but that he decides, not what he wants, but he wants something--from the core of him outward. And that is the freedom for which Christ has freed us and called us."

Never have I read such a glowing paean to that root element of our being that makes us human, namely our freedom. And with the Milhaven thesis I have much agreement. Nay more, I fear to take issue with it lest I thereby seem to be lessening the value and importance of a man's freedom. But take issue I must. For Milhaven has elevated freedom into an absolute; it seems that freedom is for the sake of itself; that freedom itself is not to be subordinated to any higher value. This is so alien to all that I have thought and cherished these many years as a result of my own studies in philosophy, theology, and scripture, that I should like to give some of these thoughts expression here. These issues have not been brought up in Milhaven's essay, and perhaps he has answers, and perhaps it is the limitation of writing for a weekly magazine with its restrictions of space that prevented his discussing these ideas. Perhaps, it is that his whole approach to these matters is so different from mine, that my admittedly traditional and conservative approach is not even taken account of any more. But for what it may be worth here goes.

Man truly becomes a man only when he becomes free of interiorly restraining influences that impinge upon his ability to choose in the fullest human way. Exterior restraints are not under consideration. "Stone walls do not a prison make, nor iron bars a cage." But our own passions, our anger, our subconscious habits, or unconscious motivations and diminutions of our free action, social customs, sickness, fear, unreasoned convictions, shibboleths, and a host of other factors, make us less free, and thereby less human. It is only when we have struggled free from these fetters, as the fly struggles free from the marmalade, that we can begin to act in a truly free way. Now are we truly human. But this is not the climax, the apex of things; rather this is the foundation, the groundwork, the presupposite of any of our actions which are truly human. Christian living, nay, any human living, must be free; but it is not a freedom to do or be anything we please. It is indeed important that we decide, but even more important what we decide freely. If the world is too much with us, so that its influence diminishes our freedom, then we can truly exclaim, Great God! I'd rather be a pagan suckled in a creed outworn. For it is better freely to choose something wrong, than in a constrained or unfree way to choose that which happens to be objectively right. But given the case of two people being equally free, does it not matter what each person chooses, --caring for one's children

or deserting them? helping, serving, or loving another, rather than spurning, scorning, or hating them? Yes, what we decide is important. Which has the higher value? The freedom, or the choice itself, viewed in its content, not simply as being free? Are the right choices for the sake of freedom; or is freedom for the sake of making the right free choices? If the latter then freedom is not the highest value.

One hesitates to call names, but for the sake of shorthand, let me call Father Milhaven a voluntarist. It is an old and honorable tradition in the history of Christian thought. Duns Scotus, St. Anselm, Pascal, William of Ockham, and to a certain though limited extent, St. Augustine, are all in this vein, wherein prominence is given to the will as opposed to the intellect.

According to the classic expression, the Divine Attributes as our imperfect, (but only) human mode of knowing conceive them, are those perfections that exist in God formally and necessarily, and that either constitute the essence of the Divine Being, or are deduced from this essence. The Formal constituent, the fundamental perfection from which all others can be logically deduced, is God's self-subsistence, His necessary existence. Among God's operative attributes or perfections deducible from this Essence is the Divine Intelligence. And then, but only then, can man logically conclude that God, since He has the power to know, must also have the power to will. God's will, in other words, according to man's use of his own human intelligence, flows logically from the Divine Intelligence, not vice versa. Hence, God is free, as Father Milhaven reminds us, and the Divine Freedom may be said to be the Divine Essence, in the sense that all of God's perfections are identified with His Essence. But, in another sense, God's freedom is bound by His knowledge, His wisdom, and the natural necessity of things to be true to their nature. In the classical Christian theology, even the ontological possibility of things outside God, find their formal and immediate foundation in the divine intellect rather than in the divine omnipotence or will. These are important distinctions for they cast light on priorities and distinctions in our own lives. Just as, properly understood, God's freedom is a logical development of his intelligence, and is bound by this intelligence, and by a knowledge of the true nature of things and man's place in the universe, and his relationship to his creator.

One can quote the Scripture for almost any kind of a sermon, so as a counterfoil to the Milhaven quotations, let me give an assemblage of my own, and all these chosen from the same St. Paul, to whom Father Milhaven appeals:

But thanks be to God that you who were the slaves of sin have now obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine into which you have been delivered, and having been set free from sin, you have now become the slaves of justice. (Romans 6, 17.)

As you yielded your members as slaves of uncleanness and iniquity unto

iniquity, so now yield your members as slaves of justice unto sanctification.... But now set free from sin and become slaves to God....(Romans 6, 19-22)

But now we have been set free from the Law, having died to that by which we were held down, so that we may serve in a new spirit." (Romans 7,7)

Therefore I myself with my mind serve the law of God. (Romans 7, 25)

Serve the Lord Christ. For he who does a wrong will reap the wrong he did, and there is no respect of persons. Master, give your slaves what is just and fair, knowing that you too have a Master in heaven. (Col. 3, 25; 4,1)

So, freedom is great; without it a man is not a man; it is man's highest constitutive perfection; and it is only in the exercise of freedom that man acts in a truly human way. But this freedom in its turn is given to us in order that we may freely serve. That we may freely obey. That we may freely acknowledge God and His authority over us. For God does not want a constrained or physically predetermined response from his free creatures. He wants their free response. But he is not indifferent to what that response is. It is not all the same to Him whether we love or hate, kill or save, lie or tell the truth, obey His laws or not. If our actions and responses are not free, through some of those constraints indicated above, such as fear, passion, sickness, social custom, habit, etc., then these actions and responses are not the important human actions and responses, and as such are not as it were grist for the divine mill. It is only our free actions and responses that count in the divine balance. But it does make a difference into which pan of the scales the free actions throw themselves.

And this making of choices, this freedom, is for the sake of making the right free choices; paradoxical though it may be, freedom is for the sake of the law. For it is only in making free choices that we can obey the law in a free human way.

Everything finally comes down to love. As St. Thomas More could say of the values he died for, "Finally it is not a matter of reason; finally it is a matter of love." But if ever there was an intelligent love, an informed heart, it was his. Love is truly love only when it is free; but the lover, the Divine Lover, is not indifferent to the love He has shown us. He is not unconcerned as to whether his love is unrequited or not. He tries to show us in a thousand ways how he would have us respond to his love. But He cannot show us too cogently, too insistently, lest thereby we lose our freedom, and are swept off our feet, and forced to love and obey Him. He has provided a very delicate balance in these matters. Too few hints, too few or too weak indications as to the response He wishes, and man will not realize what God wishes for him. Too strong, too many, too overpowering an indication as to His desires, and we

lose our freedom.

So, He has left us hints, indications, law; but He has left us free to follow these hints, to obey this law, for He wants our free service. And even though it is not a popular doctrine today, it is solidly and firmly grounded in Scripture and Christian tradition.

Let me close this point with a reference to my favorite, St. Augustine, who recognized as few have done the poise and equilibrium needed in our lives; he recognized that love is love only when it is free; but that for intelligent men, love must also be infused with reason. Hence, he held up to us not just love, not just reason; but a fusion, and a marvelous balance between the two, when he reminded us that our ideal should be, "Love choosing wisely."

* * * * *

If I may I should like to comment on Professor Stumph's annoyance at what Vatican II said on the layman in the Church. These thoughts are few and I will state them simply:

1. A verbal exegesis of the documents of Vatican II will be insufficient to discover the mind of the Church in this matter. One would have to read the other reports on the Council, such, for instance, as Xavier Rynne's four volumes, one on each session. There one will discover that the final text was often a) a compromise version, not fully satisfying anyone; b) written in a hurry, and not always properly nuanced.

2. As Robert Louis Stevenson once said, "Books at best are but a bloodless substitute for life," and the documents of Vatican II are such anemic ersatz counterparts of the rich blood and vital activity manifested in the Church today. Instead of looking at the imperfect documents of the Council, we should note the actual place the layman is taking in the church today. Look at the lay editors of *Commonweal*, *National Catholic Reporter*, *The Critic*; notice how laymen are taking their place on the boards of trustees of Catholic colleges and universities; how they are providing similar leadership on diocesan school boards; observe the enormous influence of such philosophers as Jacques Maritain, Etienne Gilson, James Collins, Dietrich von Hilderbrand, on Catholic thought, and all these are laymen. (See *Opus Dei* article in *Time*, May 12, 1967.) This problem will be solved by the layman himself; his numbers, intelligence, training, concern, will produce such pressures that there will be no gainsaying him (not that I would want to). *Solvitur ambulando*.

3. If the layman is suffering from an ecclesiastical identity crisis, it is as nothing to that being experienced by priests in the church. Most of us realize that our purely sacramental, sacrificial, liturgical, and teaching

function in the Church do not take our entire time; and that whether or not in this time over and beyond the two hours daily which Professor Stumpf allocates for the purely priestly duties, we do this rather than that, it is all not-necessarily-priestly, and a layman could substitute. Thus, if a priest manages the physical plant of a parish, keeps the parish books, administers the parish school, meets with architects about a new convent, --he is not doing purely priestly work, and a layman could substitute. If the priest is a professor at a university, or teaches school, or works in the diocesan chancery, he is not doing purely priestly work, for which a layman could not substitute. What then should a priest be doing when he is not functioning as a priest? This problem is perplexing all of us priests, and it is a more difficult one to solve, I think than the problem of the layman. As they say, all God's children got problems.

* * * * *

Finally, congratulations to all involved in the editing and production of The Grand Inquisitor; I hope that it will continue for a long time and thrive (hopefully though under another name). I wish I could be with you all, for though my days at Chapel Hill were few and all too short, my memories are long and will always remain green.

All my best to one and all, and God bless you all,

George Zorn, S.J.

FOR USE ONLY IN
THE NORTH CAROLINA COLLECTION
